

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 21, 2003, claims 32, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-21 and claims 32-37 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Lau (US Patent No. 5,987,247).

In response to the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended the claims to correct the antecedent basis problem. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 32, 34 and 36 to indicate the employee who completed “a task.” Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are no longer indefinite.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-21 and claims 32-37 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Lau, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to indicate that the tasks are “associated with the processing of an insurance related claim.” Applicants have also amended claims 1, 8 and 15 to indicate that the client component is adapted for allowing a user to “define tasks by way of the user interface of the client component to be carried out by an employee” and allow the user to “input rules by way of the user interface of the client component which dictate which tasks should be selected.” Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as pending are clearly allowable over Lau.

Lau relates to the computer program product for building a framework of objects corresponding to a design for an object-oriented application. The framework completion subsystem (i.e. user interface) of Fig. 3 is provided on the server. The completed framework built according to Lau may then be executed in a distributed computing environment. In

particular, a three tier client/server distributed application comprises a first tier which is the client side of the application and could be, for example, a browser. The second-tier or the middle object is the server side of the application, and the third tier is the "back end" of the application.

The framework building system according to Lau assists the application developer in building Business Objects, Data Objects and Application Objects. Once the object model and implementation has been defined, the developer can generate the code and perform unit testing in a stand alone environment. Thereafter, the framework building system may be used to add necessary services, such as, for example, transaction and locking services, to enable the business objects to work in a distributed environment.

The user interface of the program for building a framework interactively generates the "interface" for the Business Objects corresponding to the business logic design. This is accomplished by displaying the various "interfaces" in various stages of completion, enacting various actions or "help guided actions" on the frameworks in various stages of completion, and implementing the Business Objects through language sensitive editing. As a result, the developer using the framework building system can enter metadata, for example, attribute names, attribute types, method names, parameters or constructive types. As shown in the tree view 401, the framework building system converts the business logic design into an initial framework which is illustrated in a tree view. The developer may modify, including add or delete, files, interfaces, modules, attributes or methods.

However, Lau fails to disclose or suggest a user interface of a client component, but merely discloses a program for building a completed framework which can be executed in a distributed computing environment (i.e. run on a client component). More specifically, Lau

fails to disclose defining tasks by way of the user interface of the client component and allowing the user to input rules by way of the user interface of the client component as claimed by Applicants.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/22/03



John J. King
Reg. No. 35,918
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P. O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200